#### UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

#### FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ARTHUR S. WEISSBRODT, JUDGE

In Re: ) Case No. 07-52890-ASW ) Chapter 11 THE BILLING RESOURCE, dba Integretel, a California ) R.S. JLF-001 corporation, ) MOTION for RELIEF from ) STAY by LSI CORPORATION Debtor. ) Adv. No. 07-5156 THE BILLING RESOURCE, Plaintiff, ) PLAINTIFF'S MOTION for ) ORDER to SHOW CAUSE ) REGARDING PRELIMINARY v. INJUNCTION re ORDER to STAY DAVID R. CHASE, Federal Receiver, ) ENFORCEMENT of OMNIBUS ORDER et al., Defendants. ) Wednesday, November 21, 2007

#### Appearances:

For the Debtor Steven B. Sacks, Esq. and Plaintiff/Movant Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton (via telephone in the afternoon): San Francisco, California 94111-4109

For the Committee Maxim B. Litvak, Esq.
(via telephone): Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young & Jones
150 California Street, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4500

For the Committee John D. Fiero, Esq. (via telephone): Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young & Jones 3 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1020

San Francisco, California 94111-5994

San Jose, California

From the Federal Trade John Singer, Attorney Commission (via Michael Mora, Attorney telephone): 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20580

Appearances continued on next page.

Appearances:

For the Federal Walter K. Oetzell, Esq.

Receiver, David R. Danning, Gill, Diamond & Kollitz, LLP Chase: 2029 Century Park East, Third Floor

Los Angeles, California 90067-2904

For LSI Corporation: Jenny Fountain, Esq.

Robert A. Franklin, Esq. Murray & Murray, P.C.

19400 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 200

2

Cupertino, California 95014-2548

For the Owner of the

Property:

David M. Wiseblood, Esq.

Seyfarth Shaw LLP

560 Mission Street, Suite 3100 San Francisco, California 94105

From the Federal Collot Guerard, Esq. Trade Commission Richard McKuen, Esq.

(via telephone): 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20580

For PaymentOne Steven H. Warren, Esq. Corporation (via O'Melveny & Myers LLP telephone): 400 South Hope Street

400 bouch hope beleet

Los Angeles, California 90071-2899

Digital Court United States Bankruptcy Court

Recorder: Clerk of the Court

Erin Coyle

280 South First Street, Room 3035

San Jose, California 95113

(408) 535-5003

Certified Electronic

Transcriber: Palmer Reporting Services

Proceedings recorded by digital recording; transcript produced by federally-approved transcription service.

	Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction 3		
1	Wednesday, November 21, 2007 10:58 o'clock a.m.		
2	<u>PROCEEDINGS</u>		
3	THE COURT: Oh, that's Billing Resource, fine. Okay.		
4	That makes sense now.		
5	MS. FOUNTAIN: Good morning. Jenny Fountain and Bob		
6	Franklin of Murray and Murray for LSI Corporation.		
7	THE COURT: Good morning.		
8	MR. SACKS: Good morning. Steven Sacks, Sheppard		
9	Mullin, for the debtor.		
10	THE COURT: Good morning.		
11	MR. WISEBLOOD: Good morning, Your Honor. David		
12	Wiseblood appearing on behalf of the owner of the property and		
13	interested party. Just listening in this morning.		
14	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Wiseblood.		
15	MR. LITVAK: Good morning, Your Honor. Max Litvak		
16	with Pachulski Stang for the Creditors' Committee.		
17	THE COURT: Can you tell me your last name?		
18	MR. LITVAK: Sure, Your Honor. Litvak, L-i-t- —		
19	THE COURT: Oh.		
20	MR. LITVAK: $v-a-k$ . Good to meet you.		
21	THE COURT: Nice to meet you. You're not a Goltziana;		
22	you're a Litvak? You don't know what that means?		
23	MR. LITVAK: No.		
24	THE COURT: You don't know the distinction? Can you		
25	write it down? Write down Litvak and Goltziana, and then go		

```
Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction
                                                                     4
1
    back to your firm and ask them what it means.
 2
              MR. LITVAK:
                            Okay.
 3
          (Laughter.)
 4
              MR. LITVAK: Let me write - homework -
 5
              THE COURT: Can you write -
              MR. LITVAK: - assignment.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Can - yeah, homework assignment.
 8
              MR. LITVAK: Okav.
 9
              THE COURT: And no written memo back.
10
          (Laughter.)
              THE COURT: But Litvak and Goltziana; do you have
11
12
    that?
13
              MR. LITVAK:
                            I got it.
14
              THE COURT: Good. Okay. Thank you.
15
              Okay. Counsel?
16
              MS. FOUNTAIN: Yes. We have worked out a stipulation
17
    whereby the Court will enter an order pursuant to Section 362(j)
18
    providing that the relief from - or the automatic stay does not
19
    apply to LSI Corporation and that the debtor may remain in
20
    possession of the premises to and including 12/31/07, assuming
21
    that the debtor will pay 150-percent rent, which is the
22
    hold-over rate that LSI is currently required to pay.
23
    event that LSI remains in possession after 12/31/07, the debtor
2.4
    may also remain in -
25
                           Wait.
              THE COURT:
```

## Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction 5 1 MS. FOUNTAIN: - possession -2 THE COURT: Oh, I see. If LSI -MS. FOUNTAIN: If LSI -3 4 THE COURT: - is in possession... 5 MS. FOUNTAIN: - after 12/31/07, the debtor may also remain in possession up to the day that LSI vacates. 6 7 We would also request that this order issue a writ of 8 possession upon the request of LSI in the event the debtor does 9 not vacate on 12/31/07 or the date that the debtor or that LSI 10 vacates. 11 THE COURT: What kind of notice do you need to give 12 them that you're vacating after 12/31? I mean, if you all of a 13 sudden pick up at three o'clock and vacate, you can't expect 14 them to have vacated by 4:30 the same day. You need to give 15 them some kind of - what's going to happen? 16 MS. FOUNTAIN: Certainly -17 THE COURT: How is it going to work? 18 MS. FOUNTAIN: Sir, we can give the debtor three days' 19 notice, as we would under state the law. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Is that okay? 21 MR. SACKS: Well, I think if this is going to go past 22 12/31 we should probably have more notice than that. And I 23 think they will know earlier than that. So maybe we can say 2.4 December -25 THE COURT: Seven days' notice? Is it -

### Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction 6 1 MR. SACKS: Given that that would make it the evening 2 before Christmas, I was going to suggest December 15th. 3 THE COURT: No, no, no. You have until the end of the 4 year. 5 And we're only talking about them vacating after the first of the year, aren't we? 6 7 MS. FOUNTAIN: Correct. MR. SACKS: 8 Right. 9 MS. FOUNTAIN: LSI intends to vacate on 12/31, but in 10 the event that it does hold over longer. 11 THE COURT: Right. So we're not talking about 12 Christmas at all. 13 MR. SACKS: Well, I -14 THE COURT: Oh, you mean the notice would come 15 Christmas? 16 MR. SACKS: What - right. What I was suggesting was 17 that if they're going to be able to stay past December 31, if they are not giving up possession, that they would know that by 18 19 the 15th of December and could give us notice by that date that 20 they -21 THE COURT: Do you think that's true, that by the 15th 22 you'll know whether you're staying past the 31st? 23 MS. FOUNTAIN: Your Honor, -2.4 THE COURT: You have this man pacing behind you. 25 MS. FOUNTAIN: - I don't know that that's true.

# Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction 7 1 THE COURT: I don't know that he's going to let you 2 finish the hearing without knocking you over and trying to 3 address the Court. But I'm just mentioning it, because I don't 4 want it to get -5 You obviously want to say something, Mr. Franklin. 6 MR. FRANKLIN: Yeah. LSI has every intention of being 7 out of the premises by 12/31. THE COURT: So they just want to know, so it's 8 9 reasonable, if you're going to stay over, since they have the 10 right to stay over, how they're going to know what you decided. 11 MR. FRANKLIN: I don't know how to do that. I mean, I 12 think that it - by 12/15, I don't know whether they will be -13 will know whether they're going to be out or not. Their 14 intention right now is to be out by 12/31. 15 THE COURT: Okay. But can't we say that you're going 16 to be out by 12/31, but if you're not, you'll give them at least 17 some minimum notice that they - that they can stay for these -18 whatever -19 MR. FRANKLIN: Sure. And if we're not going to be 20 out, we can give them notice, right. 21 MR. SACKS: That's all we're talking about.

THE COURT: Yeah, all right. But we still haven't quantified the notice. We're still - I mean, as far as this conversation goes, you could tell them on 12/30, on New Year's

That's all they're talking about.

MR. FRANKLIN:

22

23

24

25

```
Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction
                                                                     8
1
    Eve, "We're staying, we're staying."
 2
              Do you need a few minutes to talk, or -
              MR. FRANKLIN: I just don't - I'm - I'm trying to
 3
 4
    conceive of what that situation would be.
                                                I mean -
 5
              THE COURT: You're not moved out, you're thinking -
    you need a little more time. People have -
 6
 7
              MR. FRANKLIN: We're - we're a subtenant. We're a -
 8
    sorry - we're a tenant; we're subleasing to the debtor.
9
              THE COURT: I know.
10
              MR. FRANKLIN: And I think Mr. Weissbrodt's client
11
    is -
12
              THE COURT: I am Weissbrodt, he's Wiseblood.
13
         (Laughter.)
              THE COURT: We knew that would happen, didn't we, Mr.
14
15
    Wiseblood?
16
              MR. WISEBLOOD: Your Honor, yes - yes, we did.
17
    nice to know that there's some consistency in our relationship.
18
              MR. FRANKLIN: Nice to know I'm so predictable, too.
19
              THE COURT: All right. Well, what do you say, Your
20
    Honor? What was your ruling?
21
              Go ahead. So talk for five minutes among yourselves,
22
    and let me do my calendar, and then come back.
23
               [COUNSEL]: Okay.
2.4
         (The hearing was recessed at 11:03 a.m. and resumed at
    11:16 a.m. as follows:)
25
```

	Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction 9			
1	THE COURT: Okay. Billing resource.			
2	MS. FOUNTAIN: Robert Franklin and Jenny Fountain for			
3	LSI Corporation.			
4	THE COURT: We're going to try again to see if he			
5	let's you go through with this.			
6	That's not going to affect you one bit, Mr. Franklin.			
7	MR. SACKS: Steven Sacks, Sheppard Mullin, for the			
8	debtor.			
9	MR. LITVAK: Max Litvak for the Creditor's Committee.			
10	THE COURT: Did you find out yet?			
11	MR. LITVAK: Not yet.			
12	THE COURT: You've had plenty of time.			
13	MR. LITVAK: Not yet, Your Honor.			
14	(Laughter.)			
15	THE COURT: And there was an appearance on the phone?			
16	Was Mr. Wiseblood on this one, or no?			
17	MR. SACKS: He was, but -			
18	THE OPERATOR: He was.			
19	THE COURT: Mr. Wiseblood?			
20	THE OPERATOR: No, I just cut him off.			
21	THE COURT: We're off the record.			
22	(Off the record from 11:17 a.m. to 11:18 a.m.)			
23	MR. WISEBLOOD: Still good morning, Your Honor.			
24	THE COURT: Go ahead.			
25	MR. WISEBLOOD: Still good morning, Your Honor. David			

## Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction 10 1 Wiseblood for the owner. And I did get disconnected by your 2 staff, perhaps. The absence of a black robe this morning, Your 3 Honor. 4 THE COURT: I understand. Well, there's a little 5 competition, you know, Mr. Wiseblood. They're -MR. SACKS: Are you wearing a bathrobe, Mr. Wiseblood? 6 7 THE COURT: - very protective of the Court's 8 jurisdiction. 9 MR. WISEBLOOD: Yes, Your Honor. I respect that, Your 10 Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. So my understanding is that 12 you may have a deal? 13 MS. FOUNTAIN: Yes, I believe we do. So, as we were 14 discussing earlier, the comfort order under Section 362, that 15 the stay does not apply, the debtor will vacate on 12/31/07 or 16 later, in the event that LSI is in possession of the premises 17 after 12/31/07. 18 However, the debtor must vacate on the date that LSI 19 vacates. A writ of possession to issue in the event that the 20 debtor does not vacate. However, LSI will give five days' 21 notice of the date that it will vacate the premises, so - five 22 business days' notice. 23 So on 12/31, we'll give five business days' notice 2.4 prior to that, and on a go-forward basis. The writ may execute 25 upon the expiration of that five days. The -

### Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction 11 1 THE COURT: Assuming you're really out. You have to 2 be out, because they have the right to stay as long as you're 3 there. 4 MS. FOUNTAIN: Correct. 5 THE COURT: So the writ - you'd have to say - in your request for the writ, you have to say, "We're out, they're not." 6 7 MS. FOUNTAIN: And we gave the five-day -THE COURT: And we gave the five-day notice? 8 9 MS. FOUNTAIN: Correct. 10 The debtor will pay the hold-over rent at 150 percent, 11 plus the concomitant expenses, the triple-net lease, and all 12 catch-up payments from past due arrearages from the expiration 13 of the lease through termination at 12/31 will be made on 14 December 1, 2007. 15 THE COURT: Is that your agreement? 16 MR. SACKS: It is, Your Honor, with the caveat that if 17 we agree with the landlord on a lower rent rate, then we would 18 pay that as opposed to the 150 percent. 19 THE COURT: Well, any contract is modifiable by the 20 parties. So if you've made an agreement that's different from the - what you've recited on the record, then, of course, it 21 22 would be binding. 23 MR. SACKS: Right. I'm just recognizing that LSI is a 2.4 pass-through here. And the reason that we're setting the 150

percent is that they are presently obligated to the landlord at

25

### Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction 12 150 percent. If we were -1 2 THE COURT: Oh, I see. MR. SACKS: - if we were able to modify that for our 3 4 benefit on our space that the landlord, then LSI doesn't need a 5 150 percent. So they're not intending to make a profit on the 6 rent payment here. 7 THE COURT: And that's correct, isn't it? MS. FOUNTAIN: That's correct. 8 9 THE COURT: Very good. Thank you. That will be fine. 10 Now who's preparing the order? I'd like both of you 11 to sign off on it. It's not your standard order, so you both signed off - sign off on it. 12 13 MS. FOUNTAIN: We will prepare the order, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Very good. Thank you. 15 MS. FOUNTAIN: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 [COUNSEL]: Thank you very much, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. Court is adjourned. We're off 18 the record. 19 (The hearing was recessed at 11:21 o'clock a.m. and continued at 2:07 o'clock p.m. as follows with all parties 20 21 appearing telephonically:) 22 THE CLERK: This is the United States Bankruptcy Court 23 for the Northern District of California. Court is now in 2.4 session. 25 THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

	Motion for Order to Show Cause re Preliminary Injunction 13			
1	This is the case of Billing Resource. And I'm going to take			
2	appearances of counsel in the order I have them. We'll start			
3	with Steven Sacks.			
4	MR. SACKS: Yes, Your Honor Steven Sacks and Michael			
5	Ahrens, Sheppard Mullin, appearing for the debtor.			
6	THE COURT: Walter Oetzell.			
7	MR. OETZELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Walter			
8	Oetzell of Danning, Gill, Diamond & Kollitz, LLP, on behalf of			
9	David R. Chase, the Federal Receiver.			
10	THE COURT: Collot Guerard?			
11	MS. GUERARD: Collot Guerard, the Federal Trade			
12	Commission.			
13	THE COURT: Maxim Litvak?			
14	MR. LITVAK: I'm here, Your Honor.			
15	THE COURT: Okay. John Fiero?			
16	MR. FIERO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. John Fiero			
17	also for the Committee.			
18	THE COURT: Stephen Warren?			
19	MR. WARREN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Stephen			
20	Warren of O'Melveny & Myers on behalf of Payment One.			
21	THE COURT: John Singer?			
22	MR. SINGER: John Singer on behalf of the Federal			
23	Trade Commission, here, Your Honor.			
24	THE COURT: Neal Goldfarb?			
25	THE OPERATOR: Your Honor, this is the operator. We			

# The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction 14 1 still have no appearance for Mr. Goldfarb as of yet. 2 THE COURT: Michael Mora? MR. MORA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael Mora 3 4 for the Federal Trade Commission. 5 THE COURT: Is there anybody else on the phone whose name I have not called? 6 7 (No audible response.) THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, I have written a draft 8 9 decision granting a preliminary injunction. I also have some 10 concerns. The argument that the Eleventh Circuit has before it 11 12 now, the propriety of the Florida District Court's order before 13 it, and that the Eleventh Circuit has granted and then lifted a 14 stay. And that the argument that what the Eleventh Circuit does 15 in terms of the stay issue is either identical to or very 16 similar to what this Court would do in the context of issuing an 17 injunction. Those arguments are not lost on me. 18 And so if I issued an injunction, we're going to 19 become embroiled in appeals on that. And, frankly, there's not a lot of law out there on this issue. There is law on related 20 21 issues. 22 Plus, in the meantime, I've done some more research 23 and come up with a couple of cases that probably the parties

should look at. One is Bulldog Trucking, 147 Fed.3d 347 Fourth

Circuit. And it's 19. The last digit is 8, but I can't read

2.4

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

### The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction

15

whether it's 1958 or - no, it must be 1998 - I don't know. 1 Ι don't have it - I can't read my digit.

And the other one is Christopher Village versus United States 360 Fed.3d 1319 Fed Circuit 2004.

MR. [SPEAKER]: Could you please repeat the last number, please, Your Honor? I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Yeah. Christopher Village versus United States 360 Fed.3d 1319 Fed. Circuit 2004.

MR. [SPEAKER]: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And if I'm right that I have exclusive jurisdiction to what constitutes property of the estate, then those cases will be particularly instructive.

The other thing I've been looking at is 362(a)(3), which basically - and cases, too. And basically what that says is that even if something isn't property of the estate, if it's from the estate - and we'll talk about what that means in a minute - then the stay applies, and that the debtor can have a possessory interest in something, even if the other party has been adjudicated as owning it.

So just to give you a very simplistic example, if there has been prepetition litigation regarding the ownership of a car and the nondebtor party has been determined by a court to own the car, if the car is sitting in the debtor's lot, the debtor has a possessory interest in the car. The owner of that car, or the person who has a judgment saying they own the car

2.4

#### The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction

can't come pick up the car without relief from stay from the Bankruptcy Court.

Now, I'm not — I'm not doing anything more than raising some of these issues with you. I have real questions how the receivership action for contempt could possibly be part of the police or regulatory power exception to 362(b)(4), since I don't understand that the Government was a party to the contempt proceeding. So that's problematic.

But in any event, I have several options. And I'm considering these options. And as one party said to me the other day, "The Court has been blunt with us and direct with us." And I intend to go on doing that. And by "blunt," I don't mean any disrespect to you. It's just I basically want you to know where I am in terms of my thinking about the case. And I appreciate your being candid with me to the extent you feel it's appropriate.

I thought of issuing a preliminary — I got the FTC's brief on the fact that the argument that it — if I issue a TRO again, it's in effect a preliminary injunction, subject to appeal. So I'm aware of that argument.

And so one possibility would be, for example, to issue a preliminary injunction of limited duration and take it through December 14.

I've also considered whether I should abstain from the whole injunction question for the reasons that I articulated

#### The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction

earlier and, that is, the Eleventh Circuit has the issue.

2.4

But what I was hoping to do today is to obviate the need for further litigation, at least for the indefinite future, by structuring an agreement whereby the funds would remain in a blocked account, the 1.7 that we've put in the blocked account, through this Court, not through anything the debtor did prepetition or postpetition, until we reached an agreement.

And the FTC and the Receiver have made it very clear that what they're concerned about is that I would unblock the funds and they wouldn't have time to appeal.

And the debtor presumably wants maximum flexibility to unblock the funds, if they need the funds. And to some extent those are mutually-exclusive goals.

But what I would suggest is that as of the present time the funds wouldn't get unblocked until a decision on December 7. And they wouldn't be unblocked before December 14, absent some, you know, enormous emergency.

And I was going to suggest that we work out some arrangement, pursuant to which the funds will remain blocked indefinitely, without prejudice to the debtor's ability to come back and ask them to be unblocked. And if they do make that request, it has to be on at least a week's notice to the FTC and to the Receiver.

And then I wouldn't, even if they screamed emergency, unblock them for a minimum of 10 days until after the hearing.

2.4

# The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction

So that's the FTC and the Receiver aren't going to be in any worse position. They'll be in a slightly better position than they are now.

Now, if we were able to agree to that, the funds would remain blocked and the FTC would have — and then the Receiver would have their respective goals of having the funds blocked and having time to get to an Appellate Court.

If I abstain, for example, then the debtor is going to be in a potentially-contempt posture almost immediately. If I issue a preliminary injunction of limited duration, then potentially the FTC is going to have much less time, although the FTC could appeal from the PI of a limited duration, I suppose. And I assume that's what they would do. Whether they'd find a court that was willing to hear it if the preliminary injunction was only going to last a couple of weeks. I don't know.

But my goal would be to structure something that served both of your interests. I, frankly, don't see the debtor needing these funds on an immediate basis. And it's not clear to me whether they're going to need them at all, depending on upon how, in particular, how the reorganization goes.

And when I say, "not need them at all," I mean not need them for ongoing business operations. I don't mean that the debtor would in any way give up its claim that those are property of the estate, that those funds are property of the

2.4

#### The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction

estate. I just mean to need to use in an ongoing business sense.

And it seems to me that we ought to be able to work out a structure that served everybody's interest, with everybody having to give up something, some — you know, the debtor wouldn't have maximum flexibility. And the FTC wouldn't have a hundred-percent protection.

But if we could structure something that made you comfortable enough on both sides, that that would be an everybody's interest, more than me just deciding between one of these three options, PI until March, PI of limited duration, abstention, and then bringing in all these other problems, including the possibility that we'd be doing additional briefing on all of these issues, anyway, by the issues.

I've also taken a look at *Gruns*, the *Gruns*' case, but that was under *Rooker-Feldman*. And it deals with a state court, so I'm not sure that's going to be helpful. I'm not a hundred — I still don't understand, frankly, the argument that the District Court has jurisdiction — I'm sorry — that the FTC's action is a function of the police or regulatory power of the government, the FTC's consent proceeding. I don't understand that. But, in any event, if we can work something out, none of that would be litigated at this point.

Now let me start with the Receiver's side or the FTC side. But I don't know to whom I should address this question.

### The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction

And you're all in different cities. So if you want me to recess for ten minutes, and you can talk among yourselves, the debtor can talk to the Creditors' Committee.

One of the questions I have — and I still don't understand it — is whether the Creditors' Committee in Florida or in the Eleventh Circuit, filing briefs and, if not, why not?

It seems to me that if the Creditors' Committee thinks that debtor is correct, having its presence be shown as part of the bankruptcy, — you know, is having a very strong interest in the bankruptcy estate, it might be extremely helpful to that side of the picture.

But, in any event, — and I certainly understand that counsel for Payment One has input. And I don't see Ms. Diemer on the line. I assume we contacted her, but she's not on the line.

So, in any event, I'll do whatever you want, but I'd be glad to take a ten-minute recess. If people want to articulate what their positions are now, I'd be glad to hear that, too.

MR. SACKS: Your Honor, this is Stephen Sachs. It may be helpful if I go first. And so I would propose to do that for just a second.

We've been doing our analysis, obviously, as to whether we need immediate use of \$1.7 million. And our conclusion at this time is that, subject to working out an

2.4

### The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction

arrangement, as the Court is describing, being protected from a contempt proceeding and being able to go forward in this Court with an amended adversary complaint of which we would seek a ruling that this is, indeed, property of the estate, as well as property — but it doesn't matter at that point whether it's property from the estate, but I certainly agree with you that would be taking property from the estate, that we would agree to the proposal that the money remaining in the blocked account while that litigation is going forward and only come out if we gave notice as the Court has described. So essentially we're onboard.

What we'd like to do is get an agreement that we could amend our complaint. We would then most likely bring a summary judgment motion to establish that this is property of the estate, and everybody can litigate whether it is or it isn't.

And we would then only be releasing the money, hopefully, upon a final judgment, as opposed to having to litigate preliminary-injunction-type of issues here.

THE COURT: Counsel for the Receiver, Mr. Oetzell, you and Mr. Mora have been here most frequently. Just procedurally what do you want me to do? I'll ask Mr. Oetzell first and then Mr. Mora.

I'm only asking procedurally. I'm not asking you to do anything more than tell me whether you want me to recess for ten minutes, or what you want me to?

### The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction 22 1 MR. MORA: I would prefer recessing for ten minutes. 2 Our client's on the East Coast. And, you know, it's the weekend 3 before Thanksgiving and all that. 4 THE COURT: Well, but they're on the phone. Most -5 the lawyers are on the phone. All the lawyers who have appeared regularly, Ms. Guerard has appeared regularly and, of course, 6 7 Mr. Mora. 8 But, anyway, - okay. So if I - and, by the way, if 9 you'll agree that nothing gets done, we could have this hearing 10 on Monday. It's not - there's no emergency, except for the 11 emergency that's raised by the possibility of having to issue 12 yet another injunction and, you know, having a one-day 13 injunction be appealable becomes a little crazy. But I also 14 understand the FTC's concerned about the clock ticking, and all 15 of that. 16 So I'd be glad to recess. How long do you propose, 17 Mr. Oetzell? 18 MR. OETZELL: Fifteen minutes would be fine. 19 THE COURT: That's fine. Okay. Is anybody opposed to 20 a 15-minute recess? 21 (No audible response.) 22 THE COURT: So Gentner, or CourtCall? Operator, 23 operator? 2.4 THE OPERATOR: Yes, Your Honor. I'm sorry. 25 THE COURT: Okay. Operator, put everybody back.

## The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction 23 1 They're going to all have their little, you know, little 2 colloquies and discussions. And everybody needs to be called 3 back. And we'll make it a guarter to 3:00. 4 THE OPERATOR: Yes, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. 6 [COUNSEL]: Thank you, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. 8 THE OPERATOR: John and Collot, I'll call you. 9 conference... 10 MS. GUERARD: All right. Let me give you... 11 (Proceedings recessed from 2:24 p.m. to 2:47 p.m.) 12 THE COURT: The Court is back in session. 13 Mr. Sacks, have you had an opportunity to talk your 14 clients, or whatever you're doing? 15 MR. SACKS: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Mora, have you had an 17 opportunity to talk your client? 18 And, Mr. Oetzell, the same? 19 But first Mr. Mora. 20 MR. MORA: Your Honor, we haven't had an opportunity 21 to talk to our client. But the attorneys caucused amongst 22 ourselves. And we are prepared to explain to the Court what 23 we're prepared to do today. 2.4 THE COURT: Very good. Okay. So why don't we start 25 with you, Mr. Mora? Are you the spokesperson, or is Mr.

### The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction 24 1 Oetzell? 2 MR. MORA: I'm counsel for the Federal Trade 3 Commission, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: I'm sorry. What? 5 MR. MORA: It is Mr. Mora, like in -THE COURT: Fine. I'm just asking whether you'd 6 7 agreed that you'd have a particular spokesperson? 8 MR. MORA: Yes. Mr. Oetzell represents the Receiver. 9 THE COURT: No, I know that. I understand that. 10 MR. MORA: Okav. 11 THE COURT: But I -12 MR. SINGER: Your Honor, we - Your Honor, this is John 13 Singer. We didn't have a chance to confer with Mr. Oetzell. I 14 don't know if Mr. Mora did, but I don't think we -15 MR. OETZELL: Yes, I did, John. 16 MR. SINGER: Okay. I apologize, then. 17 THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Mora, you're on deck. 18 MR. MORA: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 Your Honor, it's really - in this short timeframe, 20 this was quite unexpected. Frankly, we expected to, you know, 21 have a ruling read into the record today. So I'm -22 THE COURT: Yes. Well, that's what I told you I was 23 going to do, until I had my Deputy call you and say we were 2.4 going to have this conversation. 25 MR. MORA: Understood. So the most we can consent to

### The Court's Decision on the Preliminary Injunction 25 1 today amongst ourselves, is we would agree to, notwithstanding 2 our position, that we believe that the temporary restraining 3 order expires on the 25th, which is Sunday, we would agree to 4 consent to treat the temporary restraining order currently in 5 effect as continuing in effect through the close of business on 6 Monday, so that we would have a chance to, frankly, confer with 7 our clients on responding to Your Honor's suggestion. THE COURT: Oh, I see. 8 Okav. Well, Mr. Sacks, is that good for you? Shall we have 9 10 a hearing on Monday? 11 MR. SACKS: We can have a hearing on Monday, Your 12 Honor. 13 THE COURT: Yeah. I have - I can - I can hear you on 14 It's no problem. Let me just look at my calendar. 15 Yes, I have an Inns-of-Court meeting at noon. But we can meet 16 either - you know, you're not going to have much time, because 17 tomorrow is the last bus - no, today is the last business day 18 before Thanksgiving. So maybe it would be best if we did it in 19 the afternoon like 1:30-ish, or 2:00? 20 MR. SACKS: That would be -21 THE COURT: That way you'd have the morning. 22 Otherwise, I don't know how much time you're going to have to 23 consult with... 2.4 (End of the recording at 2:49 o'clock p.m.) 25 -000-

State of California	)	
	)	SS.
County of San Joaquin	)	

I, Susan Palmer, certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the above pages, of the digital recording provided to me by the United States Bankruptcy Court, Northern District of California, of the proceedings taken on the date and time previously stated in the above matter.

I further certify I am not a party to nor in any way interested in the outcome of this matter.

I am a Certified Electronic Reporter and Transcriber through the American Association of Electronic Reporters and Transcribers, Certificate No. 00124. Palmer Reporting Services is approved by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to officially prepare transcripts for the U.S. District and Bankruptcy Courts.

Susan Palmer Palmer Reporting Services Dated December 4, 2007